Application No. 10/002073

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant submits this Amendment and Response to respond to the Office Action dated August 22, 2005. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, and 23 have been amended and Claims 4 and 17 have been canceled without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter. Claim 30 has been added, accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-30 are now pending.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of October 14, 2005. Prior to the telephone interview, the Examiner was supplied with proposed amendments to the claims. During the interview, differences between the cited art and the claimed invention were discussed. Although no agreement was reached with regards to allowability of the claims, the Examiner indicated agreement with Applicant that none of the cited references disclose a table where maximum processor capabilities are stored. The Examiner stated that additional searching would be required if the proposed amendments were entered. The Examiner also indicated that a Request for Continued Examination would be the quickest way to further prosecution of the pending application.

Claims 22-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as being indefinite. In the amendments set forth above, Claim 22 has been amended to delete the aspects of those claims found to be indefinite. In view of the amendments to Claim 22, it is submitted that the rejections of Claims 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,104,721 to Hsu ("Hsu") in view of either U.S. Patent No. 5,925,092 to Swan et al. ("Swan"), U.S. Patent No. 6,314,447 to Lea et al. ("Lea"), or U.S. Patent No. 6,484,265 to Borkar et al. ("Borkar") alone or in combination. In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 to be proper, the prior art references relied upon must teach, suggest, or describe each and every element as set forth in the claims. However, all of the limitations set forth in the pending claims are not taught,

-8-

Application No. 10/002073

suggested, or described by any of the above mentioned references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is generally directed toward a method for dynamically allocating tasks in a computer system. As amended, Claim 1 recites in part, "assigning a maximum computer resource load to each of a plurality of computer platforms, wherein a first of said computer platforms has a first maximum computer resource capability and load and a second of said computer platforms has a second maximum resource capability and load." Claim 1 further recites, "providing a computer resources table, wherein indications of maximum computer resource capabilities for each of said plurality of computer platforms are maintained." Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, for example at page 4, ll. 3-10; page 7, ll. 3-7; and page 14, ll. 8-14. None of the cited references teach, suggest, or describe a table wherein indications of a first maximum computer resource capability for a first computer and second maximum computer resource capability for a second computer are maintained. Furthermore, processors described in Hsu have the same maximum processing capabilities and therefore indications of maximum computer resource capabilities are not stored in a table. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2, 3, and 5-14 are not obvious in view of any of the cited references, and the rejections of Claim 1 and dependent claims therefrom should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 15 is generally directed toward a method for dynamically allocating computer tasks. As amended, Claim 15 recites in part, "dynamically specifying a first maximum capability of a first computer processor; dynamically specifying a second maximum capability of a second computer processor." Claim 15 further recites, "maintaining a computer processor capability table, wherein dynamically adjusted capability values for said first and second computer processors are stored that are related to said first and second maximum capabilities of said first and second computer processors." As noted above, none of the cited references teach, suggest, or describe maintaining a computer processor capability table wherein dynamically adjusted capability values related to maximum processor capabilities are stored. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 15 and

-9-

Application No. 10/002073

dependent Claims 16 and 18-21 are not obvious in view of any of the cited references, and the rejections of Claim 15 and dependent claims therefrom should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 22 is generally directed toward a computer resource allocation system. Claim 22 recites in part,

"at least a first computer platform comprising at least a first computer resource and a second computer platform comprising at least a second computer resource, wherein said at least a